arXiv:1702.04133v2 [physics.soc-ph] 8 Mar 2017

# Integrated assessment modelling as a positive science: private passenger road transport policies to meet a climate target well below 2°C

J.-F. Mercure[a,b,c,*], A. Lam[b], Sophie Billington[c], Hector Pollitt[c]

[a]*Department of Environmental Science, Radboud University, PO Box 9010, 6500 GL Nijmegen, The Netherlands*
[b]*Cambridge Centre for Environment, Energy and Natural Resource Governance (C-EENRG), University of Cambridge, The David Attenborough Building, Pembroke Street, Cambridge CB2 3QZ, UK*
[c]*Cambridge Econometrics Ltd, Covent Garden, Cambridge, CB1 2HT, UK*

**Abstract**

Transport generates a large and growing component of global greenhouse gas emissions contributing to climate change. Effective transport emissions reduction policies are needed in order to reach a climate target well below 2°C. Representations of technology evolution in current Integrated Assessment Models (IAM) make use of systems optimisations that do not provide sufficient insight on consumer response to real policy packages for extensive use in policy-making. Here, we introduce FTT:Transport, an evolutionary technology diffusion simulation model for road transport technology, as an IAM sub-component, which features sufficiently realistic features of consumers that enables to simulate the impact of detailed climate policies in private passenger road transport. Integrated to the simulation-based macroeconometric IAM E3ME-FTT, a plausible scenario transport decarbonisation is given, defined by detailed transport policy package, that reaches sufficient emissions reductions to achieve the Paris Agreement.

*Keywords:*
Integrated assessment modelling, Climate policy, Passenger road transport, Evolutionary economics, Vehicle choices

## 1. Introduction

Road transport emits 17% of global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, a flow of carbon that grows by 2-3% every year (IEA, 2015a). Transport also uses a major proportion of oil produced worldwide: 48% of global oil extraction powers one form or another of motorised road transport (IEA, 2015b).[1] While developed economies (e.g. USA, Japan) typically have low transport activity growth, middle-income nations (e.g. Brazil, China, India) have fast growth rates (EI, 2015). Policy for transforming the environmental impact of transport is a key area to model in detailed Integrated Assessment Models (IAMs).

Traditionally, IAMs with high detail in energy end-use technologies have been based on system cost-optimisation or maximisation of the utility of the representative agent[2]. The optimisation methodology used in IAMs is useful from a normative perspective as it helps map out feasible space and determine what are desirable configurations from a societal point of view (e.g. see IEA-ETSAP, 2016a). The carbon price is used as a *control* parameter that internalises the climate externality, which moves the solution in technology space towards decarbonisation.

Optimisation interpreted in a positive scientific sense implies consumers with perfect information and no preferences tied to the social context. In this work philosophy, this representation is deficient, as it is unlikely, from

*Corresponding author: Jean-François Mercure
*Email address:* J.Mercure@science.ru.nl (J.-F. Mercure )

[1] 158 EJ of oil was produced in 2013 and transformed into many products of which 42 EJ was gasoline and 51 EJ was diesel, of which 34 EJ and 42 EJ were used in road transportation.

[2] Cost-optimisation models include PRIMES(E3MLab, 2015), MESSAGE (IIASA, 2013), REMIND (PIK, 2011), AIM-enduse (NIES, 2012), TIMES (IEA-ETSAP, 2016b), TIAM (UKERC, 2011), GET (Grahn et al., 2013); utility maximisation (general equilibrium) models include GEM-E3 (E3MLab, 2013), IMACLIM (CIRED, 2006), GEMINI (EPFL, 2008); bottom-up technology models based on discrete choice theory include IMAGE/TIMER (Bouwman et al., 2006), IMACLIM (CIRED, 2006), CIMS (Rivers and Jaccard, 2006). Simpler IAMs such as DICE (Nordhaus, 2013) and FUND (Anthoff and Tol, 2014) are also optimisations.




Figure 1: Price data for vehicles in six major economies, reproduced from Mercure and Lam (2015).

a behavioural science point of view, that choices of consumers should be incentivised and coordinated by the chosen externality price in exactly the way implied by the optimisation (Mercure et al., 2016). Two major issues are problematic in current IAMs (Wilson et al., 2015):

1. Many if not most IAMs feature only one single policy lever for decarbonisation: carbon pricing (through emissions trading), which is applied to all emitting sectors. Real-world climate policy, however, features a rich diversity of possible incentives, while emissions trading does not usually cover all sectors.
2. The collective response of agents to policy incentives (and their degree of access to/interest in reliable relevant information) is assumed to be coordinated in such a way that a system cost minimum or utility maximum is realised. The real world is, however, far from coordinated in total system cost perspective.

In order to effectively inform policy-making, it is crucial to clearly delineate normative (i.e. "tell me what are the components and I will tell you the best way to organise the system") from positive (i.e. "tell me the context and I will predict what people will choose") modelling methods. Optimisations interpreted as positive descriptions are not realistic representations of the impacts of real policies, and suggesting so would be misleading.

In particular, passenger road transport is not normally covered by emissions trading, but many other policy types are used (registration and/or fuel taxes, subsidies, etc see ICCT, 2011). The 'cost' of vehicles as mitigation options in the traditional modelling sense is not very well defined since the (lognormal) frequency distribution of vehicle prices spans a range often much larger than its average (see figure 1 and the data in Mercure and Lam, 2015). The heterogeneity of vehicle consumers is large. Determining the stringency of policy necessary to incentivise technological change requires analysing the structure of the market. For example, luxury hybrid vehicles have higher emissions and are more costly than equivalent conventional fuel economic cars; they are nevertheless typically preferred by luxury class consumers. Furthermore, the price of high end vehicles is comparatively so high that the incentive to such consumers of a carbon price is negligible.

To better understand this requires using tools and knowledge from behavioural economics as well as marketing research, which has been largely overlooked by IAM modellers. Wilson et al. (2015) and McCollum et al. (2016) make a compelling argument for the inclusion of significantly more behaviourally relevant information and functionality in

existing IAMs, including a particular emphasis on heterogeneity, social influence, and the number of policy instruments represented. This plea applies to markets for private vehicles, where the heterogeneity of consumers is high (Mercure and Lam, 2015) and social influence dynamics, typically not modelled, may well have as much explanatory power as prices (e.g. McShane et al., 2012, Wilson et al., 2015).

Whether agents are believed to minimise costs or not is not the issue to resolve: the result of agents individually optimising their costs and benefits *does not* necessarily lead to a cost optimum at the system scale, i.e. to an optimising representative agent/social planner (Kirman, 1992). We showed elsewhere (Mercure, 2016, Mercure et al., 2016) that, in a quantitative social theory, as soon as agents interact with one another and *value* the behaviour of other agents when making consumption decisions, fads, fashions, band-wagon effects arise. These effects break the connection between cost/utility-optimisation at the individual agent level, and optimisation at system level.[3] Multi-agent influence *leads to diffusion dynamics* (as in Rogers 2010; see also the work on information contagion by Arthur and Lane 1993, Lane 1997).

Wilson et al. (2015) reviews an extensive body of knowledge on social influence in vehicle choice. Social influence is a recursive, self-reinforcing effect that is not tractable in systems optimisation. It generates a system in which the state of diffusion is indeterminate as it is not a unique function of input prices (hysteresis) but depends on the order of past events (path-dependence, see Arthur, 1989, Arthur et al., 1987). In systems optimisation, increasing returns generates the additional difficulty of sorting multiple cost-equivalent but radically different pathways and track model instabilities: which ones are the 'correct' optimal outcomes? Social influence 'attracts' agents towards the adoption of popular innovations and away from unpopular ones, despite direct costs and benefits (Arthur, 1989, Arthur and Lane, 1993, Brock and Durlauf, 2001a,b). In other words, the value ascribed by consumers to the choices of others can be as influential to their choices as the sum of the characteristics of the alternatives themselves.

This effect is not only generated by social influence: if one considers that the availability of technology to agents may be restricted by existing market shares (availability follows the size of the industry), which grow with technology diffusion (the more technologies diffuse, the more agents can access them), then market shares partly determines the pace of diffusion, which is another recursive problem of the same form. Technology producers expand production capacity following demand growth, and demand grows following technology availability. In fact, in a model, it is not straightforward to empirically attribute the effects of social influence, technology diffusion and industry growth dynamics. Whichever the root source, these dynamical effects are mathematically crucial to allow, as they determine whether or not in a model agents behave identically to each other (and to the representative agent).

It is therefore not sufficient to parameterise current optimisation models with additional consumer behavioural information, if the methodology remains tied to optimisation at the system level, which precludes these effects by construction. It is noteworthy that the same recursive effects arise in animal population ecology (Kot, 2001), and in fact one finds that evolutionary modelling methods can achieve realistic consumer representations with behavioural heterogeneity and social influence (Young, 2001). We describe one here, developed at IAM scale.

In this paper, we introduce a positive evolutionary model for simulating the aggregate evolution of road passenger vehicle fleets worldwide, FTT:Transport[4], as a subcomponent of the simulation-based IAM E3ME-FTT. In section 2, we summarise the theoretical background and empirical basis of the model. In section 3, we show plausible endogenous projections of low-carbon vehicle diffusion as a result of specific transport policies for fast decarbonisation consistent with a target well below 2°C . We conclude with a methodological recommendation for policy-relevance.

## 2. Background, model and method

### *2.1. Technology diffusion as band-wagon effects*

Discrete choice theory (DCT, Anderson et al., 1992, Ben-Akiva and Lerman, 1985, Domencich and McFadden, 1975) is the main workhorse to regress choice by non-interacting heterogeneous agents. Agents in a DCT model are assumed to have knowledge of, and have access to, all options available in the market (perfect information). The resulting multinomial logit (MNL) can also be mathematically derived from a problem of utility maximisation under

[3] In other words, if agents behave following their peers to any degree, the aggregate macro-behaviour of a group of cost/utility-optimising agents does not result in an optimum at the system level (and conversely).

[4] Future Technology Transformations for transport; see also FTT:Power,(Mercure et al., 2014).

budget constraint when utility follows a constant elasticity of substitution (CES) model (Anderson et al. 1992, see also Mercure 2016), where the elasticity is related to the heterogeneity of agents. MNLs and optimisation models[5] thus share a common theoretical foundation, in which agents do not interact with one another, and base choices on infinitely detailed information. Changes in the utility of the representative agent is often interpreted in welfare terms. These models do not endogenously generate diffusion profiles consistent with what is observed (S-shaped curves, e.g. see Grübler et al., 1999, Nakicenovic, 1986), unless externally constrained to (e.g. by just the right carbon price[6]).

In diffusion problems, it is specifically the case that agents *do not* have (or wish to have) access to or knowledge of all existing options in the market, since it is precisely the case that some options are largely unknown/untried recent innovations with small market shares and correspondingly small production capacities, and thus limited access. Production capacity for new technologies are not expanded instantaneously to respond to changes in consumer demand; indeed, consumer demand and production capacity co-evolve over time. Widely used products have a higher capacity for diffusion, both because they are more visible and they have a larger producing industry (Bass, 1969, Fisher and Pry, 1971, Mansfield, 1961, Marchetti and Nakicenovic, 1978, Sharif and Kabir, 1976). These properties are core elements of innovation diffusion theory (Rogers, 2010).[7] Such band-wagon effects also make a key component of transitions theory (e.g. Geels, 2002, 2005, Rotmans et al., 2001, Turnheim et al., 2015), some Agent-Based Models (ABM, see Holtz, 2011, Kohler et al., 2009) and other types of positive models of technological change (Holtz, 2011, Holtz et al., 2015).

Including interactions between agents (agents learning from each other, i.e. social influence) in a discrete choice model leads to diffusion dynamics of products in markets (Mercure 2016, see also Arthur and Lane 1993). Here, we use the so-called 'replicator dynamics', a mathematical system used in evolutionary theory to describe the selection process in evolutionary problems (evolutionary game theory, Hofbauer and Sigmund, 1998), which we derive below (see Mercure 2015, 2016, Safarzynska and van den Bergh 2010, and Young 2001, 2009 for broader discussions). Its dynamical behaviour is consistent with empirical diffusion observations (e.g. Fisher and Pry, 1971, Mansfield, 1961, Nakicenovic, 1986).

### *2.2. A bounded-rational discrete choice model with heterogenous agents*

Consumers in vehicle markets are highly heterogenous, and this heterogeneity varies by country (fig. 1, see also Mercure and Lam 2015). This heterogeneity manifests itself through differentiated prices, which typically increase exponentially with linearly increasing engine sizes (vehicle power, *ibid*). Taking account of heterogeneity is crucial in models to quantify the impact of pricing policies on rates of adoption (e.g. registration taxes ). Indeed, if the distribution of prices spans an order of magnitude (such as in the UK, USD15k-150k in 2012), then purchase and/or fuel tax schemes will generate different levels of incentives in different market segments, and the diffusion of new technologies often starts in more affluent segments of the population.

Heterogeneity can be 'observed' from the market because markets, consumers and regulation co-evolve: entrepreneurs continuously attempt to better match the differentiated tastes of consumers, while consumer tastes are influenced by the market and how it evolves. The distribution of prices reflects consumer taste heterogeneity, itself related to a myriad of socio-economic contextual parameters (e.g. income, geography, culture, etc). This changes over time, however, and thus historical trends are also required.

It is not necessary in a model to track every individual agent or agent type in order to represent heterogeneity: DCT statistics can be used. However, in a bounded rational model, agents do not know every vehicle model type in the market (i.e. we reject perfect information)[8] but, rather, consumers choose within various subsets of the market. Modelling this can be done using pair-wise comparisons of options *weighted according to the number of agents* carrying out these comparisons. These weights are the market shares of each vehicle type, reflecting the probabilities of consumer learning events, for example through visual influence (as in McShane et al., 2012).

[5]Computable general equilibrium (CGE) and cost-optimisation (partial equilibrium).

[6]Partial equilibrium (cost-optimisation) models can be described as 'moving equilibrium' models (Young, 2009), in which diffusion is driven by appropriately chosen external parameters producing the right profiles.

[7]These are also common concepts in marketing research carried out by firms placing products, going back to (Bass, 1969, Smith, 1956).

[8]E.g. in Mercure and Lam (2015), we reviewed the characteristics of over 8000 different individual models in registration data for the UK, from DVLA (2012a), and we are fully convinced from that experience that consumers in the UK do carry out such an exhaustive search when choosing a vehicle.

This model structure reduces the comparison problem to chains of binary logits, in which agent preferences are treated as distributions of the perceived costs and benefits of technologies, and compared at every time step of the model. When faced with a choice between vehicle categories $i$ and $j$, a fraction of agents making the choice will prefer technology $i$, denoted $F_{ij}$, while the rest will prefer $j$, denoted $F_{ji}$, where $F_{ij} + F_{ji} = 1$. Denoting that option $i$ is perceived by that subset of agents to have a generalised perceived cost (costs minus benefits, defined below) $C_i$ that follows a frequency distribution $f_i(C - C_i)$, and cumulative distribution $F_i(C - C_i)$, with mean $C_i$ and standard deviation $\sigma_i$ (and similarly for option $j$), the fraction of agents making the choice preferring $i$ over $j$ is:

$$F_{ij}(\Delta C_{ij}) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} F_j(C) f_i(C - \Delta C_{ij}) dC, \quad \Delta C_{ij} = C_i - C_j, \tag{1}$$

which, if $f_i$ is a double exponential Gumbel distributions (as in standard DCT), yields the classic binary logit (see Domencich and McFadden, 1975). The standard deviation can be treated using the standard error propagation method:

$$F_{ij} = \frac{1}{1 + \exp\left(\Delta C_{ij}/\sigma_{ij}\right)}, \quad \sigma_{ij} = \sqrt{\sigma_i^2 + \sigma_j^2}. \tag{2}$$

This is a logistic function of the ratio of the mean cost difference to the price difference distribution width. This requires any perceived cost difference to be larger than the combined standard deviations for any noticeable diffusion to take place. This is how, in choice models, rates of diffusion relate to heterogeneity, and is one way to model individually cost-minimising agents under social influence without retorting to normative whole systems optimisation. Distributions such as in fig. 1 are used for parameterising $f_j(C)$. FTT is thus parameterised by cross-sectional datasets.

### *2.3. The replicator dynamics equation of evolutionary theory*

We take $S_i$ as the market share of option $i$ (the number of units of type $i$ in the fleet, with respect to the total). We evaluate exchanges of market shares between technology categories as time goes by, the magnitude of which is determined by preferences $F_{ij}$, while the rate originates from the fleet turnover. At each time step $dt$, the amount of shares flowing away from category $i$ into category $j$ is proportional to the number of vehicles of type $i$ requiring replacement, itself proportional to the market share $S_i$. The number of agents replacing vehicles of type $i$ exploring the possibility of purchasing a vehicle of type $j$ is a subset of all agents who have access or have reliable knowledge of option $j$, which is proportional to the market share of option $j$ (see Mercure, 2015). Being probabilistic, shares flow simultaneously in opposite directions but with typically unequal magnitude (if preferences are exactly 50/50%, then the net flow is zero). The expression for the net flow is the replicator dynamics equation (also called Lotka-Volterra):

$$\Delta S_{j\to i} = S_i S_j \frac{F_{ij}}{\tau_i} \Delta t, \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{dS_i}{dt} = \sum_j S_i S_j \left( \frac{F_{ij}}{\tau_i} - \frac{F_{ji}}{\tau_j} \right). \tag{3}$$

This is a dynamical equation that is path-dependent and hysteretic (Mercure, 2016).[9] Costs and policy incentivise agents to make choices that orient the trajectory of diffusion, and the trajectory has momentum.[10] Costs are influenced by learning curves, typically stronger for new technologies,[11] reinforcing diffusion and path-dependence. The mathematics describe a system in perpetual flow without equilibrium, and indeed, problems of technology diffusion do not have steady states.[12] Innovations come and go, as the popularity of novelty products rises and later declines.

[9] Meaning that shares are not single valued functions of perceived costs, they also depend on configurational history: many sets of $S_i$ can occur with each set of $C_i$, depending on what $S_i$ and $C_i$ have been in the past.

[10] By momentum we mean that the system has some degree of inertia that prevents it from changing direction very rapidly.

[11] In particular for EVs, for which battery costs drive learning.

[12] This can be expressed in a myriad of ways, e.g. from the network structure of technology evolution (Grübler, 1998), from an evolutionary perspective (Hofbauer and Sigmund, 1998, Young, 2001, 2009), from the scaling dynamics of innovation (Arthur and Polak, 2006), or from the presence of multi-agent interactions (Mercure, 2016).

### 2.4. Cost distributions database and micro-model of vehicle consumer choice

Price distributions for private vehicles are typically log-normally distributed (as observed in our data, see fig. 1 as well as Mercure and Lam, 2015). Cost-comparisons in the FTT binary logit are thus made in logarithmic space, using an appropriate transformation (see the Appendix). Consumer decisions are not made solely based on vehicle prices; future operation and maintenance costs are taken into account, with a discount rate, as well as non-pecuniary benefits. It can never be fully clear what intuitive or quantitative evaluations are carried out by vehicle consumers when taking decisions (and evaluation methods may differ across the population). For modelling tractability, we require a suitably general micro-model that can encompass all sorts of heterogenous behaviour. We use comparisons of the net-present values in log scaling, which we denote as the levelised cost of transportation $LCOT$. It expresses a discounted cost of generating a unit of transport service:[13]

$$\log\left[\sum_{t=0}^{\tau}\frac{I_i(1+T_i)+F_i(t)(1+FT_i(t))+MR_i+RT_i(t)}{(1+r)^t}\Big/\sum_{t=0}^{\tau}1/(1+r)^t\right]+\gamma_i, \tag{4}$$

where time $t$ refers to moments in a hypothetical future at which agents expect costs to take place during vehicle type $i$'s lifetime $\tau$ (i.e. not real time), $r$ is the consumer discount rate, $I_i$ is the investment (car price), $T_i$ is a vehicle specific registration tax rate, $F_i$ is the expected fuel costs times a tax $FT_i$, $MR_i$ is repair costs, $RT_i$ is a road tax or other possible policies. The $LCOT_i$ is the mean of the combined distributions of these cost components,[14] and is associated to a standard deviation in log space $\Delta LCOT_i$, calculated using the root of the sum of the squares of the variations. Phase-out regulations are approximated by setting $F_{ij} = 0$, i.e. overriding consumer choices, preventing further sales of a particular vehicle category.

An additional parameter is determined empirically, $\gamma_i$, representing all unknown constant non-pecuniary cost components (i.e. all costs and benefits not already explicitly included). This parameter has the unique value set that makes the diffusion rate ($dS_i/dt$) continuous across the transition from historical data to simulated data for $S_i$ at the start of the simulation (i.e. keeping existing diffusion trends). $\gamma_i$ is determined with a methodology described in the Appendix, and does not change over the simulation period.

### 2.5. The FTT:Transport database

Data gathering for the FTT:Transport vehicle price database is described in detail in Mercure and Lam (2015), a subset of which is shown in Figure 1. Light duty vehicle types were classified in terms of petrol and diesel vehicles, compressed natural gas (CNG), hybrid, electric vehicles (EV) and motorcycles. Each category was sub-divided into three consumer classes: economic (*Econ*, below 1400cc), mid-range (*Mid*, between 1400cc and 2000cc) and large engine vehicles (*Lux*, above 2000cc).[15] Motorcycles were divided as either above or below 125cc. Electric vehicles were classified according to price. Hypothetical future higher efficiency vehicle categories are added using scenario defined (assumed) future efficiency values; here these are meant to be tied to policy targets (see below).[16]

2012 data for new registrations per vehicle model type were obtained from either national statistics or from Marklines (2014) and matched to recent prices obtained online (Mercure and Lam, 2015). Vehicle price data were matched to sales numbers for 18 representative regions, used as proxies for 53 out of E3ME's 59 regions based on economic and regional similarities, following data availability. Data for other countries were used by proxy based on market similarities.[17] Historical total yearly distances driven nationally and total numbers of vehicles registered in national fleets were obtained from (EI, 2015, Eurostat, 2015). Historical shares per vehicle category for 53 E3ME regions were obtained by merging several datasets (EI, 2015, Eurostat, 2015, Marklines, 2014), and cover 2004 to 2012, while total fleet sizes and yearly sales cover 1990 to 2012.

[13] In dollar per person-kilometre ($/pkm).

[14] Every term is distributed; however the distribution of car prices dominates variations.

[15] We show in Mercure and Lam (2015) that engine sizes strongly relate to prices, hence this classification.

[16] Due to lack of detailed or reliable data worldwide, plug-in hybrids are not represented explicitly but are instead considered EVs. Due to lack of data, fuel cell vehicles are not currently included but may be included in the future as a dominant design forms and reliable costs can be obtained.

[17] Extensive work to be published elsewhere.

### 2.6. Projecting vehicle sales, fuel use and emissions with E3ME

FTT:Transport is built as a sub-module of E3ME (see Cambridge Econometrics, 2014), itself able to calculate global emissions and coupled to the climate model GENIE1 (Holden et al., 2013), making it a fully detailed IAM. E3ME is a non-equilibrium macroeconometric simulation model based on a demand-led Post-Keynesian structure (Pollitt and Mercure, 2017), theoretically coherent with the evolutionary simulation basis of FTT (EC, 2016). The degree to which vehicles are used is assumed not to depend strongly on their types of engines, and is calculated by regressing total vehicle use (in veh-km/y) with respect to fuel prices and income, and projecting these to 2050, using fuel prices and income endogenously determined by E3ME. The number of vehicles purchased does not strongly depend on vehicle type composition of the fleet, and thus vehicle sales are regressed and extrapolated against income and average vehicle prices, the first endogenously determined by E3ME.[18] Elasticities from the literature were used to constrain regression parameters and avoid spurious results. Fleet sizes are calculated using projected sales and a survival function derived from DVLA (2012a) data.[19]

FTT is fully integrated to E3ME with several dynamical feedbacks to the global economic simulation. In E3ME, income, prices, fuel use, investment, employment, and more quantities are calculated endogenously globally, in 59 regions, 70/44 sectors (EU/non-EU countries), 23 fuel users and 12 fuels. E3ME calculates global fuel use and combustion emissions, where fuel use for electricity generation is simulated using the sister model FTT:Power. Thus, the combination of FTT:Power, FTT:Transport and E3ME provides a relatively high definition dynamical coverage of global fossil fuel use and emissions. Disposable income is calculated based on wages, GDP, price levels and employment. Fuel prices are derived from endogenous dynamical fossil fuel cost calculations (see our model in Mercure and Salas, 2013). Fuel use from road freight transport is accounted for, but there technological change is not modelled in as much detail; biofuel mandates form the main freight decarbonisation mechanism.

### 2.7. Summary of improvements over incumbent models

We summarise here the novel improvements that FTT:Transport provides over incumbent models, in order of importance:

1. *FTT endogenously projects current diffusion trends with a consistent diffusion profile (S-shaped).*
2. *Diffusion is driven by choices of endogenously modelled heterogenous consumers, not a representative consumer.*
3. *FTT does not rely on the internalisation of carbon externalities to change the technology configuration; almost any form of policy can be modelled (currently 8 different types).*
4. *Diffusion rates cannot be made discontinuous by a sudden change of incentives or break in the policy regime (e.g. introducing a new tax or regulation), due to endogenous diffusion inertia.*
5. *Dynamic feedbacks with the global economy and other sectors of energy use, in particular fuel use, affect economic activity across countries in E3ME, which itself changes transport demand. Electricity use affects the power sector.*

## 3. Policy strategy and model results

### 3.1. Policies for decarbonising private personal transport

Policies for decarbonisation can take four forms: (1) improving the efficiency of conventional ICE vehicles, (2) promoting technological change towards lower emissions vehicles with alternate engine types, (3) substituting the fuel for lower carbon content alternatives (biofuel blends) for use in the existing ICE fleet, and (4) policies to curb the amount of driving (including changes of transport modes). In order to reach the 2°C target with over 66% probability, global emissions must be reduced to well below 5.5 GtC in 2050 (Meinshausen et al., 2009, Rogelj et al., 2013,

[18] These regressions did not include variables such as the extent of road network, congestion, urban vs rural population ratios, omitted due to the difficulty of obtaining such data consistently for 59 E3ME regions worldwide. Note that these variables change only slowly over time and therefore would not significantly improve the reliability of our parameters.

[19] FTT calculates vintage effects due to the age of vehicles and the fact that fuel efficiencies were lower in the past, based on evidence from a UK dataset (DVLA, 2012b).

Zickfeld et al., 2009). Since road transport emissions make roughly 17% of emissions, transport emissions must likely be reduced to well below 1 GtC in 2050, starting from 1.5 GtC in 2016. This necessitates at least a partially electric composition of vehicle fleets, since calculated biofuel potentials are not guaranteed sufficiently large to replace the whole current use of ≃170 EJ of liquid fossil fuels (Hoogwijk et al., 2009, Mercure and Salas, 2012). Thus, efficiency policies for conventional ICE vehicles are likely not sufficient for the 2°C target either, although they could achieve short term goals. However, they do enable policy-makers to limit the possible use of biofuels by ICE vehicles. Using a combination of all types of policies appears *a priori* to be a reasonable strategy.

Efficiency standards are traditionally imposed using regulatory policy. In the model, this corresponds to controlling the nature of substitutions in new vehicle sales, leaving existing vehicles in the fleet to work until the end of their statistical lifetime $\overline{\tau}$. This can be used in the model to force phase-in of a number of existing environmental innovations to existing conventional technologies, reducing their consumption of fuel to levels consistent with existing fleet-wide targets in different nations.

Purchase taxes are often used as a demand-pull policy to level the corporate playing field, and create space in the market for new, more expensive low-carbon technologies. Registration taxes can also re-allocate purchases along the price-engine size axis (Mercure and Lam, 2015). If such taxes applied to the vehicle price are made proportional to vehicle rated emissions, a form of 'carbon tax' is then created on future expected lifetime emissions of the vehicle. A tax on fuel matches more closely an actual carbon tax, but it is less effective per dollar paid at influencing the type of vehicles purchased, since it involves the relative consumer time preference (i.e weighting future fuel expenditures against the present car price, see Mercure and Lam 2015).

In FTT, policy formulations can take many forms (8 types are currently implemented): regulations, registration/fuel/road taxes, subsidies, biofuel mandates, and public procurement policies (authorities can get involved in kick-starting a market through government-financed purchases). To create a fast decarbonisation scenario, we used several of these types of policies, with the following strategy:

1. Setting the fuel efficiency standard of new liquid fuel vehicles to amongst the best currently available, in each vehicle engine size class, with near term compliance deadlines;
2. Phasing out by regulation the sale of low efficiency liquid fuel vehicles starting in 2018;
3. Introducing electric vehicles (and kick-starting infrastructure) in all markets in all consumer classes through public or corporate purchases (e.g. taxis) by 2020;
4. Aggressively taxing the registration of new liquid fuel vehicles proportionally to rated emissions, in order to re-orient consumer choices (here we used 100$/(gCO2/km) in constant 2012USD), starting in 2020;
5. Increasing taxes on fossil liquid fuels to acquire better control of the total amount of driving (here we used a value increasing from 0.10$ to 0.50$ per litre of fuel between 2018 and 2050 in constant 2012USD);
6. Increasing biofuel blend mandates gradually until they reach between 10% and 20% in each region in 2050.

Each of these layers of policy plays a specific role, and none of them can achieve decarbonisation task on their own; they influence the effectiveness of each other. Thus, they only work when applied simultaneously in a coordinated manner. For example, taxing registrations of vehicles based on emissions will drive consumers to the best available, and a key opportunity would be missed if only marginally higher efficiency vehicles were available for purchase. Furthermore, the biofuel mandate can only be increased to large values if the liquid fuel consumption of the fleet becomes low, otherwise the demand for biofuels could cause issues of excessive land-use changes for biofuel production (e.g. see Fargione et al., 2008, Searchinger et al., 2008).

### *3.2. Exploring the impact of policy strategy by layers*

Every nation of the World has a different vehicle fleet composition, a fact readily observed (fig. 2). ICCT (2011) reviews the policy strategy of eight European countries, which are not currently delivering sufficient emissions reductions in transport to meet the Paris Agreement (IEA, 2015b). We explore in this section how the 7 steps above can deliver sufficient cuts, focusing on the UK, the USA and China.

The UK fleet has a significant number of diesel vehicles (and related pollution), a growing fleet of hybrids and a nascent diffusion of electric vehicles. China, dominated by petrol (gasoline) engines, sees its large fleet of motorcycles decline and an emerging diffusion of CNG vehicles. The USA is dominated by large conventional engine petrol (gasoline) engines, with growing hybrid and electric fleets. These trends continue in the baseline scenario of FTT, in




Figure 2: FTT transport generation (in Tera person-kilometres per year, Tpkm/y) by five technology types in three engine size classes in the UK, China and the USA. The simulation starts in 2012. Prior to this, historical data is shown. Differences in totals arise with tax policy, where consumers drive less. The black dashed lines reproduce the baseline total for comparison.

which a slowdown of consumption of liquid fuels already takes place due to existing diffusion dynamics of alternative engine vehicles having already acquired momentum. These baseline diffusion profiles lead to a globally peaking liquid fuel consumption in the 2030s (described in the next section).

Substantial efficiency changes are currently taking place in vehicle fleets around the world, due to efficiency changes and the gradual adoption of hybrid engines. In FTT:Transport, this is projected to reduce current emissions by 52%, 62% and 69% in 2050 in the UK, China and the USA respectively. Policy for decarbonisation described above first involves regulations to phase out from the market less efficient engine types and force in emission standards across engine size classes (steps 1-2). Without other policies, this contributes additional reductions of 3%, 12% 15% over the baseline trends in 2050 for the UK, USA and China respectively, modest impacts effectively due to the modest efficiency targets achievable with ICE engines. Incentives are required for consumers to change engine size class or change technology.

Tax policies are applied (policy steps 4-5) to both (1) rated emissions and (2) fuel consumption. While the second aims at curbing the amount of driving, the first aims at incentivising choice at purchase time for lower emissions models. Fuel taxes do little to incentivise changes of technology, mainly due to our choice of an average consumer

discount rate of 15%.[20] However, they contribute to curbing driving.

Taxes on registration of vehicles proportional to emissions per kilometre have a high impact in guiding consumer choices towards low-carbon vehicles, in particular as they become available through their diffusion. In other words, the more they are adopted, the more the tax becomes effective at incentivising their adoption. EVs take considerable time to diffuse, and, thus, what is observed is that an intermediate layer of diffusion of lower emissions vehicles arises. In the UK and the USA, as well as many other countries, these are hybrids. In China, India and other countries, this is CNG vehicles. The tax also incentivises changes of engine category; however, this is limited, as consumers can typically save more tax money by changing engine type rather than engine size, while their preference for vehicle class remains (due to the $\gamma_i$ parameters). Thus in early years, consumers may change engine size, but as low-emissions vehicles become more common, the switch goes towards new technologies. With registration tax policies, the policy strategy must involve providing choice to consumers, as otherwise it only achieves raising tax income without sufficient change in emissions, and this is particularly the case for regions where EVs are not widely available.

Thus it is useful, and perhaps necessary in many regions, for the authorities to contribute in kick-starting the EV market, by sectoral regulation or public procurement, for the electrification of organised public or private fleets (e.g. city council vehicles, private fleets of taxis; policy step 3), providing a foothold to the industry.[21] A mass diffusion of EVs takes-off after 2040, at which point the fuel consumption of the whole fleet declines.

Remaining fossil fuel use is reduced further by the use of biofuel mandates. Altogether, these combined policies lead to 70%, 91% and 87% emissions reductions based on 2016 levels for the UK, the USA and China.

### *3.3. Global road transport decarbonisation, fuel use and emissions*

The composition of the global fleet is given in figure 3, top row. Given fleet turnover rates and existing trends, it is unlikely that emissions can be reduced with the diffusion of EVs alone sufficiently by 2050 to reach a climate target well below 2°C , or a 1.5°C target. Indeed, EV diffusion does not happen in time in FTT:Transport.

Instead, emissions are reduced with successive waves of diffusion of innovations, of ever lower carbon intensity. Policy step 6 involves the use of relatively high biofuel percentage blends (20%) in liquid fuels, a policy that has been controversial in Europe and elsewhere, following concerns over excessive land-use change and competition for land with food production (e.g. Fargione et al., 2008, Searchinger et al., 2008). Indeed, a high biofuel mandate does not appear realistic in the baseline. However, in the present scenario, by 2030, total liquid fuel use declines significantly due to the diffusion of more efficient combustion technologies as well as CNG and EVs displacing conventional engines. Even when including freight transport, biofuel blend percentages can in fact be increased to 20% in 2050, while maintaining global liquid biofuel use for transport below 7 EJ.[22] This enables policy-makers to decarbonise road transport to below 0.8 GtC/y by 2050 (48% of 2016 global transport emissions, Fig. 3 middle row).[23]

Fig. 3, bottom row, shows that the use of middle distillates peaks in the baseline, reflecting existing technology diffusion trends. With regulations, taxes and biofuel blends, the use of fossil fuels for road transport declines to below 30 EJ/y in 2050 (64% below the 2016 value), leading to drastic reduction of demand for crude oil, and possible economic repercussions for oil producers. Biofuel use due to the biofuel mandate is not significant with respect to current oil use, and peaks before 2050 due to fleet efficiency improvements. The use of natural gas is also comparatively low, due to a relatively low global share of CNG. The use of electricity, in a scenario where electric cars make up 33% of the fleet in 2050, remains comparatively small at 14 EJ, (with respect the E3ME 2050 total of 140 EJ), due to the very

[20] Consumer discount rates in vehicle purchases are controversial (Busse et al., 2013, OECD, 2010) and could lie anywhere between 5 and 40%. However, the fact that some studies identify high discount rates signals that some consumers take very little consideration of future fuel savings when purchasing a vehicle. At 15%, the incentive of a fuel tax, per unit of carbon taxed, is comparatively much smaller than that for a tax at registration time (e.g. see the supplementary information in Mercure and Lam, 2015).

[21] In the model, in many regions, small and mid-size EVs have zero market shares (zero sales in 2012, e.g. in India, China, Brazil), and thus, policy step 3 involved exogenously introducing non-zero shares. The assumption was that in 2020, 0.1% shares are purchased by governments to kick-start the EV markets.

[22] For reference, around 50 EJ of bioenergy is currently used globally for traditional heating and cooking (IEA, 2015b). Technological change in freight for alternate engine types could make this lower.

[23] Note furthermore that this use of biofuels declines post-2050 due to increasing diffusion of electric vehicles and the gradual phase out of ICE engines. We do not include in the transport sector land-use change emissions. Land-use modelling is required to estimate what an additional 7 EJ of biofuel production means for land-use change and agriculture emissions.




Figure 3: Global distance driven per vehicle category (in Tpkm/y, top row), global private passenger vehicle emissions in eight regions (in GtC/y) and global road transport fuel use per E3ME fuel type including freight. The black dashed lines reproduce the baseline total for comparison. Central Asia includes Russia and the former Soviet bloc excluding those in the EU; South Asia includes India and Indonesia; East Asia includes China and Japan.

high conversion efficiency of EVs. The result is that transport electrification significantly reduces global energy use, and does not imply an excessive or unmanageable new load for the power sector.[24]

## 4. Conclusion

Emissions reductions consistent with the 2°C target of the Paris Agreement have been extensively demonstrated to be technically feasible (IPCC, 2014). However, policy frameworks to reach these goals are not yet clearly established across the world, even where emissions targets are the most stringent. Existing IAMs, rich in technology options, have been used to explore the technically feasible parameter space for decarbonisation; however, being poor in their representation of specific policy instruments, these model types have not been extensively used to identify actual policy portfolios that could effectively lead to these reductions. Other policy-rich models used for this purpose are typically not global, and miss the bigger picture, including climate change, leaving a gap when advising policy-making.

[24]Total electricity demand was of order 80 EJ in 2016 and may increase to between 130 EJ (2°C ) and 170 EJ (baseline) in 2050, according to E3ME; more electricity is saved through decarbonisation than what is demanded by transport.

Models of technology used in the current IPCC literature predominantly use cost-optimisation methods and thus results must be interpreted as normative, but not as necessarily likely. When interpreted in a positive work philosophy, they imply internal scientific inconsistencies. Geels et al. (2016) assert that "Although IAMs represent a positivist philosophy of science, this discussion shows that there are alternative scientific styles [...]". This statement is technically incorrect for most, if not all IAMs, so long as behavioural science is missing from their theoretical foundations, and that technical change takes place following the optimising choices of the social planner or representative agent. For instance, IAMs focus on emissions trading and the carbon price policy instrument *because* they rely on the normative frame of how best to internalise the climate change externality, rather than on whether it has the potential to deliver sufficient emissions reductions. It is indeed not clear what system optimisation, or a 'social planner', means in consumer markets such as private mobility. Optimisation system models overestimate the effectiveness of externality pricing approaches, as they underestimate the effectiveness of more elaborate regulatory frameworks that address behavioural features of consumers.

We conclude this paper by stating that decreasing returns are now emerging with cumulative efforts at mapping the feasible decarbonisation parameter space, because this activity does not generate sufficient insight to formulate specific policy frameworks. In an effective science-policy bridge, IAMs must now attempt to study the impacts of actual policies that are currently considered by policy-makers, in their full legal definition, following the Paris Agreement. We argued that this is only possible through the use of positive behavioural science and models. We have presented an IAM simulation model component that overcomes these difficulties, featuring 8 different types of policies, which influence and enable each other, which implies that this is feasible.

## 5. Acknowledgements

The authors thank the C-EERNG centre and J. Vinuales for support, as well as N. Edwards, P. Holden, C. Wilson and D. McCollum for informative discussions. This work was supported by a fellowship of the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC), no EP/ K007254/1 (JFM), a grant from the UK's Natural Environment Research Council (NERC) no NE/P015093/1 (HP and JFM) and a grant from the UK's Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) no ES/N013174/1 (JFM, HP).

## 6. Author contributions

JFM designed the theoretical model, co-designed the scenarios and wrote the text. AL parameterised the model, co-designed the scenarios and contributed to the text. SB and HP designed and executed the econometric specifications for transport demand, maintained the E3ME model and contributed to the text.

## Appendix

### Setting $\gamma_i$ values for non-pecuniary consumer preferences

Current diffusion trends are readily observable in our data, and are not reproduced using solely arguments over vehicle costs in pair-wise comparisons. The reason is readily appreciated: vehicles can cost anything between \$15km and \$90k, and if agents minimised only vehicle costs, they would never choose vehicles priced at e.g. \$45k, or \$90k. It is noteworthy that even for a factor five in price, most vehicles offer more or less the same features, and thus to some extent, it may be that the price itself is an attractive feature of a vehicle. The distribution of prices is closely related to the income distribution (see Mercure and Lam, 2015), and since the income distribution does not change rapidly year on year, the shape of the price distribution of vehicles will also not change radically year on year.

Furthermore, the evolution of these purchases is relatively slow over time. Thus some 'value' is given by consumers to the various attributes that these vehicles possess in comparison to other less expensive models. These attributes, and the value ascribed to them, are considered constant; they are of no particular interest in the context of this work, but their representation in cost functions is crucial. Here, they are be represented by a single constant parameter $\gamma_i$ empirically derived, chosen in such a way that diffusion trends in the model are consistent with recent historical data. Indeed, the model must avoid producing changes in diffusion trends at the starting year of the simulation (2012), since no particular policy change took place then.

The FTT model, however, is non-linear, and finding a set of $\gamma_i$ values that minimises the difference in diffusion rates between the simulation and historical data is not trivial. In fact, the problem features myriads of local minima which impede finding an algorithm that can reliably identify this set. This precludes using an automated algorithm, which moreover could lead to hidden errors. Human intuition for such a task can be highly reliable, however. Thus, we have designed a convenient visual interface system with which the modeller manually finds all $\gamma_i$ parameters by comparison of the FTT diffusion profile to historical trends while iteratively altering the $\gamma_i$ values. In this manner, spurious results, which could arise with automatic search algorithm, are by definition avoided. This method has proved extremely reliable. It takes approximately 3 hours to find 1378 $\gamma$ parameters.

Costs are compared in FTT:Transport in a logarithmic scaling of cost variables. This is appropriate given that all cost distributions were empirically shown to follow lognormal distributions (see Mercure and Lam, 2015). In order not to drain computer power with unnecessary complexity, we use lognormal distributions parameterised with two values, a mean and a standard deviation. The transformation between real dollar space and log-scale space is as follows:

$$\mu = \ln\left(\frac{m^2}{\sqrt{v+m^2}}\right), \tag{5}$$

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\ln\left(1+\frac{v}{m^2}\right)}, \tag{6}$$

where $\mu$ and $\sigma$ are the mean and standard deviation in logarithmic space, and $m$ and $v$ are the mean and standard deviation in normal dollar space.

$\gamma$ values are determined in logarithmic space, and thus possess values of order 1-3. Vehicle price distributions are divided into three engine size categories for each technology category. $\gamma$ values prevent unrealistic radical change of the vehicle price distribution. Furthermore, during the process of technological change, it leads to substantial substitution of high emissions luxury vehicles for low-carbon luxury vehicles, but little substitution of luxury vehicles for low price economic vehicles which can have as low emissions in comparison to luxury low-emissions vehicles. Significant evidence points to this being the correct treatment of consumer heterogeneity (e.g. see McShane et al., 2012, Wilson et al., 2015).

## References

## References

Anderson, S. P., De Palma, A., Thisse, J. F., 1992. Discrete choice theory of product differentiation. MIT press.

Anthoff, D., Tol, R., 2014. Climate framework for uncertainty, negotiation and distribution.
URL http://www.fund-model.org

Arthur, W. B., 1989. Competing technologies, increasing returns, and lock-in by historical events. The economic journal 99 (394), 116–131.

Arthur, W. B., Ermoliev, Y. M., Kaniovski, Y. M., 1987. Path-dependent processes and the emergence of macro-structure. European journal of operational research 30 (3), 294–303.

Arthur, W. B., Lane, D. A., 1993. Information contagion. Structural Change and Economic Dynamics 4 (1), 81 – 104.

Arthur, W. B., Polak, W., 2006. The evolution of technology within a simple computer model. Complexity 11 (5), 23–31.

Bass, F. M., 1969. New Product Growth for Model Consumer Durables. Management Science Series A-theory 15 (5), 215–227.

Ben-Akiva, M. E., Lerman, S. R., 1985. Discrete choice analysis: theory and application to travel demand. MIT press.

Bouwman, A. F., Kram, T., K., K., 2006. Integrated modelling of global environmental change. An overview of IMAGE 2.4. Tech. rep., Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency.
URL http://www.rivm.nl/bibliotheek/rapporten/500110002.pdf

Brock, W. A., Durlauf, S. N., 2001a. Chapter 54 - interactions-based models. Vol. 5 of Handbook of Econometrics. pp. 3297 – 3380.

Brock, W. A., Durlauf, S. N., 2001b. Discrete choice with social interactions. The Review of Economic Studies 68 (2), 235–260.

Busse, M. R., Knittel, C. R., Zettelmeyer, F., 2013. Are consumers myopic? evidence from new and used car purchases. American Economic Review 103 (1), 220–56.

Cambridge Econometrics, 2014. E3ME Manual.
URL http://www.camecon.com/Libraries/Downloadable_Files/E3ME_Manual.sflb.ashx

CIRED, 2006. The imaclim model.
URL http://www.imaclim.centre-cired.fr/spip.php?article204&lang=fr

Domencich, T. A., McFadden, D., 1975. Urban travel demand - A behavioural analysis. North-Holland Publishing.

DVLA, 2012a. New car registrations by model 2012, UK car registration agency DVLA. UK Inside Government.
URL https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/veh01-vehicles-registered-for-the-first-time

DVLA, 2012b. Roadside survey of vehicle observations. UK Inside Government.
URL http://data.gov.uk/dataset/roadside-survey-of-vehicles
E3MLab, 2013. The gem-e3 model.
URL http://www.e3mlab.ntua.gr/e3mlab/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&id=36%3Agem-e3&Itemid=71&layout=default&lang=en
E3MLab, 2015. The primes model.
URL http://www.e3mlab.ntua.gr/e3mlab/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&id=35&Itemid=80&lang=en
EC, 2016. Policy-induced energy technological innovation and finance for low-carbon economic growth. Tech. rep., European Commission, Directorate-General for Energy.
URL https://ec.europa.eu/energy/sites/ener/files/documents/ENER%20Macro-Energy_Innovation_D2%20Final%20%28Ares%20registered%29.pdf
EI, 2015. Euromonitor international passport.
URL http://www.portal.euromonitor.com/Portal/Pages/Magazine/WelcomePage.aspx
EPFL, 2008. The gemini model.
URL http://gemini-e3.epfl.ch/webdav/site/gemini-e3/shared/GEMINI-E3v53.pdf
Eurostat, 2015. Eurostat Statistics, Employment and unemployment (LFS). Eurostat.
Fargione, J., Hill, J., Tilman, D., Polasky, S., Hawthorne, P., 2008. Land clearing and the biofuel carbon debt. SCIENCE 319 (5867), 1235–1238.
Fisher, J. C., Pry, R. H., 1971. A simple substitution model of technological change. Technological Forecasting and Social Change 3 (1), 75–88.
Geels, F. W., 2002. Technological transitions as evolutionary reconfiguration processes: a multi-level perspective and a case-study. Research Policy 31 (8-9), 1257 – 1274.
Geels, F. W., 2005. The dynamics of transitions in socio-technical systems: A multi-level analysis of the transition pathway from horse-drawn carriages to automobiles (1860 - 1930). Technology Analysis & Strategic Management 17 (4), 445–476.
Geels, F. W., Berkhout, F., van Vuuren, D. P., 2016. Bridging analytical approaches for low-carbon transitions. Nature Climate Change.
Grahn, M., Klampfl, E., Whalen, M. J., Wallington, T. J., Lindgren, K., 2013. The GET-RC model.
URL http://publications.lib.chalmers.se/publication/182030-description-of-the-global-energy-systems-model-get-rc-61
Grübler, A., 1998. Technology and Global Change. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
Grübler, A., Nakicenovic, N., Victor, D., 1999. Dynamics of energy technologies and global change. Energy Policy 27 (5), 247–280.
Hofbauer, J., Sigmund, K., 1998. Evolutionary Games and Population Dynamics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
Holden, P. B., Edwards, N. R., Gerten, D., Schaphoff, S., 2013. A model-based constraint on $CO_2$ fertilisation. Biogeosciences 10 (1), 339–355.
Holtz, G., 2011. Modelling transitions: An appraisal of experiences and suggestions for research. Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions 1 (2), 167 – 186.
Holtz, G., Alkemade, F., de Haan, F., Köhler, J., Trutnevyte, E., Luthe, T., Halbe, J., Papachristos, G., Chappin, E., Kwakkel, J., et al., 2015. Prospects of modelling societal transitions: position paper of an emerging community. Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions 17, 41–58.
Hoogwijk, M., Faaij, A., de Vries, B., Turkenburg, W., 2009. Exploration of regional and global cost-supply curves of biomass energy from short-rotation crops at abandoned cropland and rest land under four ipcc sres land-use scenarios. Biomass & Bioenergy 33 (1), 26–43.
ICCT, 2011. European Vehicle Market Statistics. Tech. rep., ICCT.
IEA, 2015a. $CO_2$ Emissions from fuel combustion. IEA/OECD.
IEA, 2015b. World Energy Balances dataset 2015. IEA/OECD.
IEA-ETSAP, 2016a. Energy technology systems analysis program.
URL http://www.iea-etsap.org/
IEA-ETSAP, 2016b. Iea-etsap optimization modeling documentation.
URL http://iea-etsap.org/index.php/documentation
IIASA, 2013. The message model.
URL http://www.iiasa.ac.at/web/home/research/modelsData/MESSAGE/MESSAGE.en.html
IPCC, 2014. Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change. Cambridge University Press.
Kirman, A. P., 1992. Whom or what does the representative individual represent? The Journal of Economic Perspectives, 117–136.
Kohler, J., Whitmarsh, L., Nykvist, B., Schilperoord, M., Bergman, N., Haxeltine, A., 2009. A transitions model for sustainable mobility. Ecological Economics 68 (12), 2985–2995.
Kot, M., 2001. Elements of Mathematical Ecology. Cambridge University Press.
Lane, D., 1997. Is what is good for each best for all? learning from others in the information contagion model. In: The economy as an evolving complex system II. Vol. 27 of Santa Fe Institute studies in the sciences of complexity. Westview press, pp. 105–128.
Mansfield, E., 1961. Technical change and the rate of imitation. Econometrica 29 (4), pp. 741–766.
Marchetti, C., Nakicenovic, N., 1978. The dynamics of energy systems and the logistic substitution model. Tech. rep., IIASA.
URL http://www.iiasa.ac.at/Research/TNT/WEB/PUB/RR/rr-79-13.pdf
Marklines, 2014. Marklines: Automotive Industry Portal.
URL http://www.marklines.com/en/service
McCollum, D. L., Wilson, C., Pettifor, H., Ramea, K., Krey, V., Riahi, K., Bertram, C., Lin, Z., Edelenbosch, O. Y., Fujisawa, S., 2016. Improving the behavioral realism of global integrated assessment models: An application to consumers' vehicle choices. Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment, –.
McShane, B. B., Bradlow, E. T., Berger, J., 2012. Visual influence and social groups. Journal of Marketing Research 49 (6), 854–871.
Meinshausen, M., Meinshausen, N., Hare, W., Raper, S., Frieler, K., Knutti, R., Frame, D., Allen, M., 2009. Greenhouse-gas emission targets for limiting global warming to 2c. Nature 458 (7242), 1158–1162.
Mercure, J.-F., 2015. An age structured demographic theory of technological change. J. Evol. Econ. 25, 787–820.
URL http://arxiv.org/abs/1304.3602

Mercure, J.-F., 2016. Fashion, fads and the popularity of choices: micro-foundations of non-equilibrium consumer theory. arXiv:1607.04155.
URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.04155
Mercure, J.-F., Lam, A., 2015. The effectiveness of policy on consumer choices for private road passenger transport emissions reductions in six major economies. Environ. Res. Lett. 10 (064008).
Mercure, J.-F., Pollitt, H., Bassi, A. M., Vinuales, J. E., Edwards, N. R., 2016. Modelling complex systems of heterogenous agents to better design sustainability transitions policy. Global Environmental Change 37, 102 – 115.
Mercure, J.-F., Pollitt, H., Chewpreecha, U., Salas, P., Foley, A., Holden, P., Edwards, N., 2014. The dynamics of technology diffusion and the impacts of climate policy instruments in the decarbonisation of the global electricity sector. Energy Policy 73 (0), 686 – 700.
Mercure, J.-F., Salas, P., 2012. An assessment of global energy resource economic potentials. Energy 46 (1), 322 – 336.
URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2012.08.018
Mercure, J.-F., Salas, P., 2013. On the global economic potentials and marginal costs of non-renewable resources and the price of energy commodities. Energy Policy 63, 469 – 483.
URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2013.08.040
Nakicenovic, N., 1986. The automobile road to technological-change - Diffusion of the automobile as a process of technological substitution. Technological Forecasting and Social Change 29 (4), 309–340.
NIES, 2012. Asia-pacific integrated model.
URL http://www-iam.nies.go.jp/aim/
Nordhaus, W. D., 2013. Dice-2013r model.
URL http://aida.wss.yale.edu/~nordhaus/homepage/Web-DICE-2013-April.htm
OECD, 2010. Stimulating low-carbon vehicle technologies oecd. Tech. rep., OECD.
PIK, 2011. Dice-2013r model.
URL https://www.pik-potsdam.de/research/sustainable-solutions/models/remind
Pollitt, H., Mercure, J.-F., 2017. The role of money and the financial sector in energy-economy models used for assessing climate and energy policy. Climate Policy, 1–14.
Rivers, N., Jaccard, M., 2006. Useful models for simulating policies to induce technological change. Energy Policy 34 (15), 2038 – 2047.
Rogelj, J., McCollum, D. L., O' Neill, B. C., Riahi, K., 2013. 2020 emissions levels required to limit warming to below 2°C. Nature Climate Change 3, 405–412.
Rogers, E. M., 2010. Diffusion of innovations. Simon and Schuster.
Rotmans, J., Kemp, R., Van Asselt, M., 2001. More evolution than revolution: Transition management in public policy. Foresight 3 (1), 15–31.
Safarzynska, K., van den Bergh, J. C. J. M., 2010. Evolutionary models in economics: a survey of methods and building blocks. Journal of Evolutionary Economics 20 (3), 329–373.
Searchinger, T., Heimlich, R., Houghton, R. A., Dong, F., Elobeid, A., F., J., Tokgoz, S., Hayes, D., Yu, T.-H., 2008. Use of US croplands for biofuels increases greenhouse gases through emissions from land-use change. Science 319 (5867), 1238–1240.
Sharif, M. N., Kabir, C., 1976. Generalized model for forecasting technological substitution. Technological Forecasting and Social Change 8 (4), 353–364.
Smith, W. R., 1956. Product differentiation and market segmentation as alternative marketing strategies. The Journal of Marketing, 3–8.
Turnheim, B., Berkhout, F., Geels, F., Hof, A., McMeekin, A., Nykvist, B., van Vuuren, D., 2015. Evaluating sustainability transitions pathways: Bridging analytical approaches to address governance challenges. Global Environmental Change 35, 239 – 253.
UKERC, 2011. Tiam-ucl global model documentation.
URL https://www.ucl.ac.uk/energy-models/models/tiam-ucl/tiam-ucl-manual
Wilson, C., Pettifor, H., McCollum, D., 2015. Improving the behavioural realism of integrated assessment models of global climate change mitigation: a research agenda. advance project deliverable no. 3.2. Tech. rep., Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research, Norwich, UK and International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), Laxenburg, Austria.
URL http://www.fp7-advance.eu/content/project-deliverables
Young, H. P., 2001. Individual strategy and social structure: An evolutionary theory of institutions. Princeton University Press.
Young, H. P., 2009. Innovation diffusion in heterogeneous populations: Contagion, social influence, and social learning. The American economic review 99 (5), 1899–1924.
Zickfeld, K., Eby, M., Damon Matthews, H., Weaver, A., 2009. Setting cumulative emissions targets to reduce the risk of dangerous climate change. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 106 (38), 16129–16134.